DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 227 VT 018 604

TITLE	Comprehensive Career Education Models: Problems and Prospects.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ. Research Corp., N.Y. Educational Policy Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
REPORT NO	EPRC-M-SYR-71-3
PUB DATE	15 Jun 71
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Policy; *Models; *Social Problems; Vocational Development; Vocational Education; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The U.S. Office of Education (USOE) has developed the Comprehensive Career Education Models in response to certain perceived social problems. There is an enormous distance, however, between the perception of a social problem and the formulation of a policy or program. In this paper, social problems are examined from a different perspective than that of the USOE with the intent of helping further revisions of the models and in framing more reasonable expectations concerning the consequences of their implementation. Three problems that constitute the policy and programmatic context for the models are: (1) the perceived failure of the schools to provide people with marketable skills, (2) failure to transmit or develop habits, dispositions, or attitudes that make a good employee, and (3) alienation from the social employment system. Not every issue connected with these problems can be influenced by policy nor are all these problems educational or have their source in the educational system. Section I of the paper provides a discussion of the policy context while Sections II and III examine the ways in which the models deal with: (1) attitude toward work, jobs, and employment, (2) issues of tracking and comprehensiveness, (3) value of introducing time as a variable, and (4) the process of career development. (SB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

COMPREHENSIVE CAREER EDUCATION MODELS: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

VT018604

LIBRARY
THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL AND
TECHNICAL EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
JUL 2 0 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072227

POLICY MEMORANDUM SYR 71 - 3

COMPREHENSIVE CAREER EDUCATION MODELS: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Educational Policy Research Center
Syracuse University Research Corporation
1206 Harrison Street
Syracuse, New York 13210

June 15, 1971

Prepared for

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VT018604

ANALYTIC CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT..... 1

The Policy Context..... 2

The Coherence of the Policy Problems..... 4

II. CAREER EDUCATION--FOR WHOM AND FOR WHAT..... 5

Attitudes Toward Work, Job, and Employment..... 5

III. SCHOOL-RELATED FEATURES OF THE CCE MODELS.....15

IV. SUMMARY.....27

Appendix A. THREE FORECASTS ON THE FUTURE OF LEISURE-TIME.....A-1

Forecast #1 - The Secular Trend..... A-1

Forecast #2 - A More Complex Forecast..... A-3

Forecast #3 - The Distribution of Work and Leisure Time..... A-4

Policy Memorandum SYR 71 - 3

COMPREHENSIVE CAREER EDUCATION MODELS: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

I

INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT

The Office of Education has developed the Comprehensive Career Education Models in response to certain perceived social problems. There is an enormous distance, however, between the perception of a social problem and the formulation of policy or program. This transition from problem to policy to program is difficult to follow successfully.

In this memorandum, however, we are called upon neither to perform policy analysis nor to make policy recommendations. The Career Education Models are themselves concerned with program and not policy. But neither are we asked to formulate program.

Although we believe that the Office of Education has chosen a likely sector of the educational enterprise on which to focus its effort, still, we believe that a somewhat different perspective on the sources and dimensions of the problems may yield fresh insight into general strategy and the prospects for success. Since we have not been asked to examine policy or formulate programs, we propose to return to the original step in the process of problem to policy to program. We propose to deal with the specification of the social problems themselves to reveal in what ways and to what extent we may find flaws and prospects for improvement in the Career Education Models as they currently exist. It is not our purpose to urge rejection nor for that matter adoption of either the models or the unstated policies contained in them. We do think, however, that there are certain ways of viewing the problems that will prove helpful in further revisions of the models and in framing more reasonable expectations concerning the consequences of their implementation.

The Policy Context:

It is not always clear what unifying basic policies underlie the development of the CCE models. It is clear, however, that there are certain concerns that constitute the policy and programmatic "context" for their development. Some of these considerations are made explicit in the models themselves or in the supporting documents. Others are left implicit. It may be helpful, however, to state them as clearly as possible, assemble them in some orderly fashion and see, if we can, how the proposed Career Education Models relate to that context and to other efforts within education to meet similar problems.

Clearly, the Office of Education is concerned that many youth leave school without marketable skills, and therefore without adequate ability to enter the "world of work." Such a state of affairs is taken to be evidence of programmatic failure on the part of the schools. In small dimensions this failure would present no serious problem to the society, but if it becomes really sizeable, it could become a fundamental threat.

But the Office of Education is concerned about other kinds of failure as well. Youth, "by the millions," are leaving school each year not only without adequate employment skills, but also without appropriate attitudes toward work and employment. They are, it is said, "alienated from the corporate establishment, ignorant about what people do in the employing organizations and lacking in any work experience outside of school walls." These first two problems are distinguishable. The acquisition of marketable skills is clearly different from the acquisition of appropriate work disciplines and attitudes--though the two are also related. But within this second problem there are further distinguishable concerns.

On the matter of appropriate attitudes toward work and employment the CCE models are not very clear. We shall have more to say about this point in another section. It is worth observing, for the moment, however, that

no one is likely to acquire marketable skills of any high order without at the same time acquiring some dispositions of discipline, craft, attention to detail, personal control, and other like traits associated with the exercise of skill and with being a "good employee." But by being "alienated from the corporate establishment" we understand the Office of Education to mean not simply the failure to acquire skill-related attitudes toward work, but the failure to develop appropriate attitudes toward the kinds of jobs that the employment system in fact makes available. It is quite possible to acquire marketable skills and still be alienated from the institutions of work. It is less likely that one will acquire marketable skills and not acquire those other work dispositions, habits, and attitudes that go with such skills.

Thus, we have here not two problems but three within the "policy context" for the Career Education Models. The first is the perceived failure of the schools to provide many people with marketable skills. The second is the failure to transmit or develop those habits, dispositions, or attitudes that make a good employee. But the third problem may exist even when the others are resolved, for it has to do not with alienation from the disciplines of work, but from the social employment system itself. All three of these problems constitute part of the "policy context" for the development of the Career Education Models as we understand it.

But the Office of Education is also aware that some of the failure of the schools in these first respects may arise indirectly from the pressures--especially strong in recent years--for more and more young people to go on to college. Partly as a consequence of this social demand, the status system within the curricular "streams" has been strengthened, the "general education" programs of the secondary system have grown, and they seem neither to prepare youth very adequately for college nor very adequately for work.

It is also an important part of the "policy context" that traditional approaches to vocational education have not been very satisfactory either.

The negative image and social stigma associated with vocational education at the secondary level (its primary locus in the USA) is a function of four interrelated factors: (1) the belief that it leads to low status jobs and less income than academic education; (2) the difficulty of obtaining access to post-secondary education from the vocational track; (3) the academic and social characteristics of the students typically channeled into vocational programs; and (4) the difficulty of providing effective vocational education within the framework of a comprehensive institution. We shall have more to say about these aspects of the problem in another section.

The Coherence of the Policy Problems:

Not every issue connected with these problems can be influenced by policy, much less, by educational policy. Not all of these problems are educational or have their source in the educational system. It is not surprising, for example, that there should be lots of unemployed high school graduates when jobs are scarce and getting scarcer. Schools do not create jobs no matter how good they are in other respects. Again, it is not obvious that the hierarchy of occupations can be altered by educational policy or that alienation from work in all of its forms, or even in its most serious forms, stems from the educational system or is subject to change by the educational system.

Thus, it is difficult to see how any basic policy can be framed to meet the particular melange of problems set in the "policy context" of the Career Education Models. It is difficult to see, for example, how any series of basic policies for education can be assembled that will lead to better attitudes toward work, better skills for employment, less stress on the demand for advanced education in the college years through the college path, and at the same time bestow higher status on traditional vocational education programs. These objectives are related, but it is not obvious

that they constitute a sufficiently singular set of objectives attainable through a single set of policies for education.

Still, we believe that these are worthy objectives and that a general and fundamental reform of career education seems a likely direction (though not as likely as some others) in moving us toward their attainment, especially if the proposed reforms have promising implications for more far-reaching changes in other aspects of the educational system. Besides we are aware that existing legislation on vocational education gives the Office of Education some scope for exercising initiative in career education that it lacks in other areas of educational policy and program. Career education is not only an area needing attention; it is also one in which the Office of Education can act.

II

CAREER EDUCATION--FOR WHOM AND FOR WHAT

We shall divide our comments in this section into two parts. The first deals with the way the models handle the problems of attitudes toward work, jobs, and employment. The second part will deal more explicitly with what we choose to call the school variables in the models.

Attitudes Toward Work, Job, and Employment:

We have argued in other work at the Syracuse Policy Center that many of the fundamental problems confronting American schools can be traced to a crisis of purpose. If there is a Crisis in the Classroom, it is nothing compared to the crisis in the purposes of schooling itself. It is no longer plausible to operate as though we understood for what purposes schools exist or as though we understood what kinds of individual and personal values

people will seek to realize or should be urged to realize in and through the schools. Thus, we believe that the most basic questions in doubt about the American school system have to do with when education should occur, where it should occur, how it should be conducted, for what people, and for what purposes. These questions are old, but their seriousness is new. They have been with us always, but often they have lain quiescent. These questions raise issues about the sequence of schooling (when), about the locale for schooling (where), about the methods of schooling (how), about the clientele for schooling (for whom), and about the purposes that people seek through schooling (for what).

It is interesting that, of this agenda for education, the CCE models deal explicitly, but in limited ways, with the issues of when, where, and how, but deal hardly at all with the questions for whom or for what purposes. The interesting features of the models stem from what issues they attempt to confront. The flaws, however, arise from what is either ignored or presupposed in their development. But if we are correct, the specification of the prospective clientele for career education and the human purposes that people will seek through it are such basic issues that a failure to deal with them will render it difficult--perhaps impossible--to deal successfully with the other questions. For a failure to properly identify the clientele and the kinds of goals they seek, will constitute a failure to correctly specify the problem. We must remember that no matter how successfully these models are implemented, they will be used for whatever purposes people find them useful and for no others. They will not necessarily be used for the purposes presupposed in their design.

Makers, Non-Makers, and Post-Makers. Let us distinguish, then, between three client groups of the schools. They will parallel certain attitudes toward school as the path to work and therefore certain attitudes toward work and employment itself.

Different groups use the schools for different things, but the dominant purpose of the American schools in recent decades has been for "making it." By "making it" we mean success in life--not just in economic terms, but also in terms of social legitimacy and status. In spite of our admiration of the "self-made man," in practice we expect people to use the schools to make it. This expectation is manifest, in fact, in the development of the CCE Models.

"Making it" includes upward economic and social mobility, but it is not identical with it. It includes also the attainment of social legitimacy or socially recognized worth. Children of the poor and disadvantaged are expected to use the schools to "make it," but so are the children of the successful. They are expected at least to go through the motions of "making it" all over again each generation, and are expected to use the schools in doing so.

Let the schools' client population (pupils and parents, primarily) be sorted into three principal groups, namely, the makers, the non-makers, and the post-makers. The first two, the makers and the non-makers, have the same set of uses of the schools and goals of education, namely, making it, in the sense discussed. They differ from one another in an important respect, however: the makers use the schools successfully; the non-makers do not. This does not mean that the makers will all be college or even high school graduates. It means that they see the schools as a vehicle for attaining or assuring adequate success, in their own eyes; and for them, the schools "work." The non-makers, on the other hand, either see themselves failing in the schools or see the schools failing them; that is, they accept that the schools have the function just mentioned, but the schools are not achieving this function in their case.

The third group--the post-makers--requires more discussion. A large and growing minority of today's school-age generation have values that apparently differ markedly from those of past generations. One element in this shift has been a change in the importance of "success," and in particular

a decline in the significance of one's job. Attitudes towards jobs, income, and economic legitimacy are strikingly different among generations. Older generations have known real poverty or real insecurity, or both, and have lived through the most catastrophic industrial collapse in American economic history. Many of the younger generation have experienced not only affluence but uninterrupted affluence, i.e., security. Among them rejection of traditional economic definitions of life's purposes is common. It is common, moreover, among precisely those youth whose own family backgrounds have been the most comfortable and secure.

We are not saying that it is becoming common among young people to reject material well-being. Nor are we suggesting that they place no value on the acquisition of marketable skills. We are saying that the post-makers have very different attitudes toward careers and jobs. The point is that material well-being is increasingly taken for granted by many of them and so, for them, the quest for economic security has ceased to be a central task of life. When survival itself is no longer an issue, and when economic insecurity is really unknown, then one's "job" ceases to be the centerpiece of one's life. The schools, both in their educating and certifying functions, and still largely in the eyes of parents, have closely keyed their own purposes to "jobs" and "success" or to further education leading to "job" and "success." As the social meaning of jobs and success declines in importance, then so must the meaning of the schools as that meaning has been understood in the past. This minority who have rejected the traditional purposes of the schools, and who are essentially beyond making it, are the group we have called the post-makers.

It is important to recognize two features of this distinction in the clientele of the schools. First, it is not a distinction that coincides with normal demographic or socio-economic groupings. It should not be assumed that the children of the affluent are all post-makers or even makers. Nor does it suggest that children of the lower class are necessarily non-makers. The distinction we are drawing is meant to cut across such standard

socio-economic groupings. Neither is the distinction identical with curricular groupings within the schools. All three groups, we believe, are to be found among the academic track and college-bound students, and all three are likely to be found among the vocational and non-college bound general education students of the high school. We recognize that the three groups--makers, non-makers, and post-makers--are unevenly distributed among these curricular groups and also among socio-economic groups. But that uneven distribution is not the point.

Secondly, what we are concerned with is a discrimination between different kinds of "goal-seeking behavior" on the part of students, not their socio-economic status. What is at issue is the purposes for which they seek to use the schools and, consequently, what they seek to gain from the school in relation to future jobs or future schooling.

The existence of such identifiably different attitudes toward the uses of the schools has enormous implications for the character and possible success of career education. It bears repeating that no matter how successfully the CCE Models are implemented, they will be used for whatever purposes people find them useful and for no others. They will not necessarily be used for the purposes presupposed in their design, but neither should their design rule out the possibility of their being used for a variety of purposes.

Jobs, Work, and Alienation. We have been considering factors influential in shaping attitudes toward jobs, work, and employment stemming from some features of the changing clientele for the schools. Let us consider more directly the terms "job," "work" and "career" and possible future shifts in their social meaning. These terms are all vague and ambiguous in ordinary usage. But for a variety of cultural and historical reasons over the past four hundred years in the West there have been strong tendencies to identify

a man's work with his job. The strength of this point can be put directly in two different ways.

First, there has been a strong disposition in the culture to identify who a man is by his job. We say of a man that he is an engineer, a telephone lineman, a mechanic, a clerk. We are not so inclined to say that he does engineering at the moment or that he does installing, or that he does mechanics, or that he does clerking, but that in the future he might do something else. Thus, we tend to find part of personal identity in occupations or particular jobs. In this way the social definition of such roles has had to carry the psychological freight of providing meaning, definition of life, personal identity, hope, and some sense of a good future. When they fail to do so, when the job becomes incidental or when it is not regarded as worthy or worthwhile, then we find alienation, not primarily from work, but from the social order itself, for it then no longer provides significance or legitimacy to people through particular jobs or positions. The tendency to discover a man's identity in his job has been with us since the Reformation. The alienating features of those jobs, their frequent failure to provide meaning and identity, have been observed for the past century and a half since the industrial revolution really got under way.

Secondly, these same assumptions about the continuing importance of jobs in providing self-identity are manifest even in some of the more extreme forecasts on the future of work. Some of the more romantic students of the future have sounded alarm at the prospect of a society in which the central fact of life is not work, but leisure. But why is such a prospect alarming? It is alarming because we persist in assuming that a man's identification of his life's work is to be found in his job. Consider what we say to people under the conditions of the possible leisure society. We say to them, "You must discover your own worth, your own legitimacy for the society in your job. But you will not be able to work at that job for more than four days a week." Under these conditions, we will have preserved a social situation that is not simply dysfunctional but cruel. It will be alienating in the extreme.

We believe that for large portions of our population this situation is already emerging and that the adjustment is in progress now. It will continue. The adjustment is likely to be found in a tendency to separate jobs from the ways that people learn to identify their life's work. There is an important difference between having work, in the sense of having employment, and having a work to perform through which one's life gains legitimacy and meaning. The latter may or may not be found in jobs. It is not likely to be found without employment. But neither should it be identified with the possession of a job or a series of jobs.

There is probably little that policy or government programs can do in helping people to find meaning in their lives or to find a life work. Policy and program can do much to make the task more difficult, however. The least that can and must be done is to recognize the problem and to keep in mind the transforming ways in which that meaning is likely to be discovered in relation to jobs and employment. We shall make some suggestions in the next section as to how this objective might be modestly met through the CCE Models.*

Summary Observations on Attitudes Toward Work, Job, and Employment. These observations on the formation of attitudes toward jobs, careers and employment have some analytic and critical utility when applied to the CCE Models. We shall state these observations in a pointed way deferring for the moment further consideration of the particular school variables related to each.

To begin with, we believe that the models do not currently take into account the multiple publics discussed above. In general, they fail to

* One thing the policy-maker needs, however, is some assurance that the trend we have been discussing is strong and likely to continue. For this purpose, we have included three forecasts in Appendix A that provide some basis for rationally assessing these matters.

recognize the existence of the post-maker group and the extremely powerful social forces that give it potential for growth. These forces are often outside the reach of educational policy and, for political reasons, they may be impossible to influence anyway. But the models also, we believe, fail to squarely confront the problems of the non-maker group.

For example, the models seem to assume that the world of school and the world of work have grown apart, and that it is necessary to draw them together again. We believe, however, that in fact the problem is somewhat different. It is at least more difficult than that. We believe that what is happening is that, for certain populations, neither world is as strongly linked to the pursuit of individual purposes as they have been in the past, and therefore both worlds seem less relevant. This is true especially for the post-maker group. But to make the schools more relevant for them, one does not revise the school curriculum around the career development idea. On the other hand, neither does one omit skill development as much as we have in recent years. For this group, some of the elements of career education should be present more than they are now, but it should not be a big thing. It should be a short-term curricular choice. More about this later.

Thus, we believe that if career education is made the dominant theme of the school, especially at the secondary level, or if it is made a dominant theme for all students, then we would expect the post-maker group to be further alienated from the school and to a somewhat lesser extent the makers also.

In relation to the non-makers, however, we have a radically different problem. Often their alienation from the school involves social sources rather than individual inadequacies. These sources include four elements: (a) racial discrimination in employment; (b) an inadequate number of jobs; (c) inadequate preparation in school; and (d) refusal of many non-makers to take menial, i.e., low status jobs.

The CCE models address themselves to only o of these problems, namely, that dealing with inadequate preparation in school. We do not really expect them to do more than that. But we cannot help noting that perhaps the most effective career development technique is a full-employment policy. Lots of good things happen in job training and career development when labor is scarce. We need only recall what happened in the years from 1940 to 1945 to see how rapidly job training can be done and what dignity can be accorded to all kinds of positions in the economy. Our point is that, with respect to certain populations, the success of the career education program is likely to be determined by events that are not primarily matters of educational policy. The design of the models and our expectations of their success must take this fact into account.

For example, the refusal of non-makers to take menial, low paying jobs even when that refusal may mean unemployment, can be interpreted as one of the costs of affluence in a society where the non-makers can readily compare their condition with others. In societies in which large numbers take such jobs, they were no badge of inferiority. Today they are. And the non-makers know it. One deals with this problem through a variety of approaches simultaneously--a full-employment policy; a post-secondary alternative to college; attacks on employment discrimination; higher minimum wages; direct government employment; and improved career education in school. The last of these is very likely to fail without the others. And with the others, it may not be necessary for the non-maker group.

This last point leads us to observe that, for a variety of reasons, the formulation of the models should avoid any claim that the career education program will eliminate drop-outs or will be modified and changed until it works as measured by successful career outcomes. These promises probably cannot be realized. Therefore, they should not be made.

Finally, it is not clear what the target population is, especially in the light of our disaggregation of the client groups of the schools. Perhaps the models are not meant to deal with education for the post-makers and

the non-makers. If they are not, then the models are not models for comprehensive career education. If they are intended to deal with these groups, then there will be serious problems of tracking. We shall deal with these issues in more detail in the next section.

It does seem clear, however, that the target outcome is career entry into blue-collar jobs and into lower levels of white collar jobs. But in view of the transforming relation between job and work, there is surprisingly little attention to the ways in which the models might provide a path toward serial careers. It is an important part of the occupational malaise of American society that there are sizeable numbers of people who do not see their jobs as leading anywhere else. This is a common blue-collar complaint. Many of these people also feel that what they are doing is not worth doing for the rest of their lives. Others of them would prefer to work at a job only long enough to get sufficient money to enable them to do what they really want to do. Others of them are not basically unhappy with their work but feel they would benefit from a change but are prevented from doing so because of accumulated "fringe benefits" that they would have to sacrifice if they moved. All these conditions are symptoms of the separation between work and jobs that we discussed earlier.

There is a great deal of rhetoric in the models dealing with career development rather than merely career entry. But in reality, the models do very little to really confront the issues for these populations. Therefore, we would expect the career education program to get an undeserved bad press on the part of certain publics. It will be viewed by them as an effort to meet the needs of employers rather than students, the demands for a stable work force rather than a developing one. This arises, we suspect, partly because the models deal with an unnecessarily small segment of the total educational system. There are important exceptions to this in the case of the home-community based model, and important principles introduced into the industry-based model which would modify this point. In short, we believe that the models are too limited in treating the question as to when education should occur and too indiscriminate in confronting the issues of for whom it should occur and for what purposes. But we shall discuss these points too in the next section.

III

SCHOOL-RELATED FEATURES OF THE CCE MODELS

In this section we want to deal with more specific school-related factors in the career education models. We realize that these models have been developed as alternatives to current vocational education practice, but they have also developed with an eye for their potential influence on the structure and practice of the rest of the system. We shall concentrate on those school-related factors relevant to such potential influence. These factors we shall group under four topics: (1) the issues of tracking and comprehensiveness of program, (2) the value of introducing time as a variable in the educational structure, (3) the limits of the models to a narrow period in the process of career development, and finally (4) some special problems in the models.

Before turning directly to these issues, however, we wish to expose certain difficulties that we have with the terminology and intent of the CCE Models.

First, except for the school-based model, it is not clear whether the target population is to be all students all of the time, all students some of the time, some students all of the time, or some mixture of these. We have reason to believe that the intent is to provide improved programs for those students currently enrolled in the non-college bound general education program of the secondary school as well as some currently enrolled in the secondary vocational program. But this target is not clearly specified. We are assuming that the employer-based and home-community based models are intended only for some students, and only for some of their total educational program. It is not clear to us whether the same assumption applies in the case of the school-based model.

Secondly, the intent back of the term "career education" itself is not clear. It is not clear whether we are dealing with vocational education under a new name, whether we are concerned with a greatly enlarged program of vocational education with an enlarged vocational content, or whether we are dealing

with an expanded version of the cooperative educational model for vocational training. Career education, in different aspects, may deal with all of these alternatives or with none of them.

Thirdly, it is not clear whether the outcome is to be general education about careers or high level technical and vocational entry skills in careers. The latter, we suspect, will necessarily require a long time and school-like settings with rather special target groups. The more general type of career education is not likely to have these same implications.

In the light of these uncertainties, the relevant school-related variables must also be somewhat uncertain. We are assuming, however, that the career education program is intended to develop rather high level technical and vocational entry skills in careers and is not intended simply to provide general education about careers. It is partly this assumption that generates the following observations about the school-related variables of the CCE models. We are assuming then that career education is conceived to be a substantial part of the total education program for some students. If this assumption is incorrect, the following observations may also be partially flawed.

Tracking and Comprehensiveness. There are two ways in which we can speak of "comprehensive education." An educational program can be comprehensive because it involves all students. The currently existing "vocational arts" program of the middle school is usually comprehensive in this sense. Shop is typically required of all boys and home-economics of all girls. But educational institutions can also be comprehensive when they provide within a single institution for a wide range of programs and levels of ability within and between these programs.

The status of a school program is likely to be strongly affected by several groups of variables. We shall mention two. In the first place,

there are those factors that relate to the intractable hierarchy of occupations as established within the society and outside the school. As we have observed before, no matter what the school does, it is not likely to alter that hierarchy. Neither teachers, students, nor parents are ignorant of that hierarchy. Thus, the status of a program within the school is going to be influenced partly by where it leads.

The status of school programs, however, is also influenced, perhaps decisively, by the characteristics of students channeled into such programs by teachers, guidance directors, and school administrators. Current practice generally results in the worst students being channeled into secondary vocational programs. Thus, such programs generally have low-status partly for reasons external to the school and partly for reasons internal to it. We may have doubts about the sources of this phenomenon, but nobody can doubt the results.

Although over a third of all high school students are enrolled in vocational programs, very few of these enter post-secondary education. Many fail to graduate from high school. Of these, only 15-20 of every hundred graduates have received vocational training. If they drop out, they are highly unlikely to re-enter formal post-secondary education, although some do get into MDTA programs, poverty programs, etc. Although community colleges in some states can take in dropouts, in practice few are served. In fact, less than a quarter of the students enrolled in vocational education at the post-secondary level had taken a vocational program in high school, which suggests that even vocational graduates do not find it easy to continue their training or are not motivated to do so. Moreover, a recent study by Jaffe and Adams has shown that the best predictor of dropouts in two-year colleges is high school curriculum. Vocational graduates were more than twice as likely to drop out because they lacked skills in language, numbers, etc. So vocational students are less likely to graduate from high school, less likely to enter formal post-secondary education and less likely to persist if they do so.

Unfortunately, vocational programs in high schools are used as a dumping ground for low-achievers, discipline problems, potential dropouts and others that the public schools would prefer to be rid of. These characteristics correlated with being black and with being from a low income background; race and class prejudice, as well as the academic values of our schools, influence the channelling of students. This differentiation has its beginning in the elementary schools when ability grouping begins--a practice that has undesirable effects on students' self-attitudes and attitudes toward other children and no demonstrated benefits in learning. The Bluebirds end up in a college-prep track while the Cardinals are in shop. The criteria used to make these assignments are unreliable and, as noted above, prejudices are often a major influence. Once a student is assigned to an ability group, there is little chance of his ever being reassigned. It is highly likely that ability grouping functions as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Thus the potential successes and potential failures are differentiated at an early stage and it is the latter group who become candidates for vocational education.

We find it extremely doubtful that really good career education can take place either within a comprehensive curriculum or within a comprehensive institution. First, if the career education program is intended to be comprehensive, in the sense of including all students in the same measure, then it is not likely to have high status or to be very well done. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, such a program would be required and would not then have higher status than the typical "vocational arts" program of the middle school. It would become, for many students, simply something to get over with. In the second place, a comprehensive program of that sort would not be able to demand enough time in the curriculum to be really thorough and competent.

On the other hand, if the program of career education is intended to result in really high quality technical and vocational skills, then it probably cannot be comprehensive in the first sense and will probably receive a lower status for reasons we have already mentioned. These reasons for the lower status of the career path stem partly from its inclusion in a comprehensive

institution and partly from current practices of tracking into such programs. Those practices are enormously difficult to change.

These dilemmas of tracking and comprehensiveness are posed not only by the intractable hierarchy of occupations within society, and by the tendency of ability groupings to become self-fulfilling prophecies, but also by the demand that genuine reform in career education will have to apply what we call the best-worst principle. By the best-worst principle, we mean the capacity to attract both the best and the worst students in the school system by the criteria of the school itself. This principle cannot be applied by including all students within the career education program. Eliminating choice is not a way of permitting the exercise of choice. Career education of really high quality, we believe, must be a curricular choice.

In general, when we consider the variety of educational experiences that a youth may confront, it is useful to consider those predesigned by others and those created or designed by the students themselves. The optimum set of experiences will be a combination of the two types. But two factors are especially important in assessing the predesigned set: one is the number of alternatives available; the other is the range of difference between them. Both factors are critical because there is no advantage to a large number of options available in the school program unless they are also sufficiently different to constitute genuine choices. This fact is especially important when viewed together with the best-worst principle. It argues that not only must career education be an option sufficiently different from the academic curriculum to attract both the best students and the worst. It must be sufficiently flexible in its format to be either a long-term or temporary option, and sufficiently demanding in its skills so as to attract the best students for at least part of their educational experience.

If these conditions are not met, we do not believe that the proposed career education program will constitute alternatives to present vocational education practices. Our skepticism on these points stems partly from our doubts that the CCE Models squarely face the dilemmas implicit in the tension

between tracking and comprehensiveness. We believe that there are extremely tough problems in these issues that the models in their current expression do not adequately confront.

We regard the home-community and the employer-based models as having high potential in meeting the conditions of the best-worst principle and in overcoming some of the worst effects of tracking and curricular status. The school-based model, we believe, has little potential in this direction because it does not represent a very substantial difference in choice compared to the usual school program.

The school-based model, in its current form, introduces some additional liabilities. Because of the intractable sources of tracking and because of its apparent consequences for discouraging subsequent post-secondary education, we believe it should be an important goal of basic educational policy to defer curricular tracking in all of its subtle forms for as long as is socially possible. At the same time, we believe that it should be basic policy not to permit any curricular programs to be regarded as terminal either in name or as a matter of social fact. Such a basic goal would increase the attractiveness of career education programs.

The school-based model, in contrast, as it currently stands, would tend to introduce curricular tracking at about the earliest point that could be rationally defended. Whatever may be the rhetoric of career education for the development of life-time careers, we believe that this step would be counter-productive. The move toward skill or occupational clusters is a move in the right direction, but even so, the school-based model is filled with implications for tracking at a very early level.

Time as an Educational Variable. One of the tremendous virtues of the community-based and employee-based models is the possibility of operationally introducing time in the model as an educational variable. But this virtue is,

we think, not adequately exploited. Furthermore, this advantage properly exploited, would put both of these educational models squarely within the main-stream of educational innovation. The principle we have in mind is simple. In standard and orthodox instructional settings, time is taken as a constant. The material to be learned is given and the mastery of that material is measured after a set period. The result is a distribution of achievement. In all programmed, most individualized, and all total mastery settings, however, the level of achievement is given and the period required for mastery is the variable. The result is again a distribution, but in these latter cases it is always a distribution of the same mastery over time rather than a distribution of degrees of mastery at a fixed time. Thus, time is taken as the variable in the instructional setting.

All learning situations that occur <u>within</u> the context of jobs and all career development processes that we know of resemble the mastery learning principle more than the traditional instructional situation. We are not bothered if it takes different mechanics different periods of time to reach the same level of competence. We treat time as the variable and, within the market constraints of manpower supply and demand, we allow whatever time is necessary to reach a given level of competence. Human problems arise in the employment system when the total mastery of a job is reached by everyone in a short period of time and the job poses no new problems. Such jobs defined in educational terms constitute terminal educational programs. There is neither social nor educational value in continuing the same persons in them. It is like forbidding them to graduate. A major problem of career education then is to provide a context for escape from that kind of job. Thus, there is an additional similarity between all employment settings and all programmed, total mastery, and most individualized settings. That similarity arises from the fact that in both cases, the educational task is transformed rapidly from one of skill acquisition to guidance, discovering, creating, and matching educational resources with students in an appropriate sequence.

Two Observations. If the career clinics in the community-home based model were to be conceived not as career entry centers, but career upgrading services involved in discovering, creating and matching the educational resources of the community in a random sequence of time for particular people at a wide range of ages, then it would constitute a genuine alternative to traditional vocational education practices. Moreover, such an emphasis developed in conjunction with the school might establish the presumption that there is an alternative to the school itself for shorter or longer periods in the development of youth. This step would have appeal for some segments of all the client groups of the schools, and would meet the conditions of the best-worst principle.

It is an important caveat that such a step be taken in conjunction with the schools. There are quite specific ways that schools currently fail to take time into account as an educational variable. For example, if it could be shown to be of high educational value for a youngster to spend an entire semester working only on automobile engines, or only on the French language, the schools would have no way of meeting that particular educational need. Experience in other countries has shown that when time is allowed in this way to become a substantial variable in education, the youngsters usually begin to find their own rhythm of work. (See the work of William Westley, McGill University). If the career clinics can be construed as making such a possibility real, and if the operational procedures are worked out in conjunction with the school, then those clinics might show the way toward some quite different kinds of educational behaviors within the schools. But perhaps the best hope of doing this on any large scale is first through some such parallel institution and, secondly, through the development of career or career-related skills.

Secondly, if such a center of educational resources were concerned not merely with entry into careers, but also with escape from them, not only with placement in jobs, but with help in creating them and in negotiating job descriptions, then it would have appeal in attacking some of the occupational malaise of the blue-collar class. But this attack requires more funding,

planning and courage than seems implicit in the development of this particular model at least so far. Moreover, such a step might make possible the invention of a great many simple technologies for education. We have in mind such a thing as the Educational Whole Earth Catalogue, or the Educational Resources Catalogue--the Blue Pages of the telephone directory listing teachers and topics that people might want to learn about.

The point is that career development is a time-variable process. So are most current educational innovations. But practically no educational practices and no educational institutions are. A major virtue of the home-community based model (to a lesser extent the employer-based model) is that it might show that career education can be conducted on principles corresponding to the ways that careers are actually developed. In this way it might also have substantial impact on the schools.

The Limited Range of the Models. Changes of emphasis, along lines just suggested, begin to suggest the limitations of the models arising from their focus on the traditional educational period from K-12. (We realize that some attention is paid to the problem to grade 14, but it is not exploited). But we have steadfastly insisted that the process of career formation is not so limited. We believe that, partly as a consequence of this limitation, the models do not take adequate account of the role of adult education or continuing education in the formation of careers, nor do they take account of the educational value of breaking the sequential structure of the system. Moreover, if we are persuasive at all in urging that problems of tracking be deferred as late as possible, then serious career education of a high order should not start earlier than perhaps grade ten. And if we are also persuasive in urging that no programs should be regarded either in name or practice as terminal, then the strategic period for career education begins in late high school and extends into post-secondary education without limit. Finally, because of these same limitations, we believe that the models are concerned perhaps too much with career education and not enough with career creation.

The point of these last observations is not so much in what they say as in what they suggest. They suggest that quite different models for career education might be made to emerge if a different perspective is taken on the strategic period of time. The immediate practical impact of such oservations is to begin to shape priorities for the phases in implementing these models, if they are adopted. Which segments should be developed first? Moreover, when we begin to see, particularly the community-home based model as the agent for career development along the lines suggest, then its emphasis shifts slightly and it becomes possible to imagine the home-community model taking preparation for serial careers as an operational goal. It becomes possible also to imagine the career education program coming to grips and operationally acknowledging the enormous implications of the distinction between job and work outlined in the preceding sections. Neither this goal, nor this distinction, nor its future prospects are prominent in the current formulations of the model.

Some Special Problems. We have already discussed some aspects of the social problems to which the CCE models are a partial response. There are other aspects of those problems that relate directly to one or another of the models. For example, we have already commented on the desirability of viewing certain prospective changes as the social costs of affluence. We believe that this perspective has special relevance to the employer-based model.

1. As a society becomes more productive in its business and industrial enterprises, time becomes more valuable. It becomes economically less feasible to conduct deliberate and predesigned learning and skill acquisition in the context of actual employment. The costs of time spent in instruction must be balanced against the same time spent in productive activities. As productivity increases, the trade-offs between these kinds of costs become more difficult. It will become increasingly desirable to separate the learning of skills from the actual employment setting. This separation of learning from employment is a part of a basic social process

that takes place in any economy devoted to constant increases in productivity. This social process may operate somewhat differently in a society heavily involved in the public service enterprises, but the principle will persist.

The viability of the employer-based model depends in some undetermined degree on the possibility of reversing this process. It depends upon the possibility of making it at least as economically desirable for an employer to devote productive resources to the process of instruction as it would be for him to devote the same resources to further production. This might be done by some structure of incentives, some of which are included in the exposition of the employer-based model. We are somewhat skeptical, however, about the prospects of success, and suspect that if this obstacle can be overcome, the results would be that it would become economically feasible for various kinds of firms to establish schools somewhat separated from the employment setting to conduct the instructional process. This would not represent a substantial gain in career education. Unfortunately, we have no useful suggestions as to how these consequences can be avoided. It may be useful, however, to caution against them.

2. We note secondly that there is, at this stage, no provision in the management system of the employer-based model for representation on the part of the public or potential students in the program. This may be a difficulty. We are not suggesting that there should be representation from organized labor in the system of governance. However, some kind of community involvement would be desirable. It may help, among other things, to remove the image of career education as something that serves the needs of employers rather than employees. It might be useful, in fact, to reflect on what would happen if the employer-based model were reconceived around a different metaphor, namely, employee-based. There are dangers, however, in any path selected.

A different path might be found in more closely relating the governance of the employer-based model, on the one hand, to a management system for the home-community based model, on the other hand. This might permit more

comfortable arrangements for representation of the community in the employer-based model and, at the same time, automatically expand the time constraints of the home-community based model to incorporate some of the features we have discussed before. For example, it might permit a more rational educational attack on the problems of blue-collar occupational problems.

3. In general, we find certain difficulties in exploring the current and potential relations between the different models as they are currently formulated. We rather suspect that the demands for efficiency, for example, will make it extremely difficult to shuffle students from one career program to another. The tendency will be to minimize the differences between schools as projected in the school-based model in order to purchase the gains of greater regularity and efficiency.

4. The three models, especially model 3, seem to count heavily upon the use of educational technologies, many of which have yet to demonstrate their educational worth. In fact, model 3 would be unthinkable were it not for the promise of technological developments like the computer and the cassette. We see as a possible pitfall the assumption that during the implementation of the model the implementers will be able to develop and test all the new and different technological applications which might or might not add to the quality of the program.

For instance, there is still a great deal of controversy over the use of computer assisted instruction, in terms of cost and educational effectiveness. If the decision was made to try to incorporate CAI in the system, would the developers take it upon themselves to develop and test their own software (a process which in all likelihood would take several years and much resources to do well, and might result in the rejection of CAI), or would they try to fit already existing programs to their needs. Presumably they would be forced to do the latter, since their main focus must be on the development of the "delivery system" and not on basic technology research.

The problem, then, is to be creative but cautious in the choice of technologies that will be used in the models, so as to avoid having to do

the basic research needed to develop entirely new technologies, while at the same time not accepting less satisfactory ones merely because they are available.

IV

SUMMARY

We have made some suggestions as to what we believe should be the general direction of policy in relation to career education. Still, we have been concerned mainly to describe in some more detail the social problems surrounding the development of the Comprehensive Career Education Models. In the first section we have tried to specify what we believe to be extremely important characteristics of these problems and to provide some rough judgments as to their future. The sources of alienation from the disciplines of work and from the employment system have been distinguished as separate problems. The clientele for career education, we believe, deserves more careful attention than it has received. The transforming ways and changing localities within which careers are discovered and developed has been described and some reasons have been offered to believe that these trends will continue.

In the second section, we have attempted to concentrate on more specific aspects of the models themselves, but always in relation to their potential for influencing the structure and conduct of other parts of the educational system. The dilemmas of tracking and comprehensiveness are in many ways intractable. From this fact it follows all the more that they should be confronted in the formulation and testing of the models. The different models have quite different virtues in relation to these problems. Some aspects of the home-community based model have been explicitly discussed in order to show how each of the models might be modified to render them more generally reformative. Finally, we have dealt with some residual problems.

Appendix A

THREE FORECASTS ON THE FUTURE OF LEISURE-TIME

Forecast #1 - The Secular Trend

Changes in the length of the average workweek are often cited as clues to the amount of available leisure time. It is generally agreed that the length of the workweek has declined steadily in the U.S. at least since 1850. In non-agricultural jobs, it has declined from about 56 hours in 1900 to its current level of about 40 hours. Thus the long-term trend has been a lowering of the average workweek at a rate over the six decades since 1900 of only slightly more than 2.5 hours per decade. Yet it can be doubted whether this long-term trend is continuing. For the approximately fifteen year period since 1955, the length of the average workweek has remained stable at between 39 and 41 hours.

Has the long-term trend come to an end or should we expect it co continue? A forecast based upon the recent past will show only a slight downward trend, certainly less than 1 hour per decade. Taking 1965 as our base point, such a forecast would project a workweek in 1995 of 37 to 38 hours, hardly enough change to produce a "leisure society." If, over the same period, we project a rate of change similar to what occurred from 1900 to 1902 (56 to 45 hours), then we would forecast an average workweek in 1995 of 24 hours, which, on other grounds, seems unlikely.

The information is ambiguous. It seems reasonable, however, to accept as a rational estimate a rate of change between the current stable situation and the high rate of 5.5 hours per decade that prevailed from 1900 to 1920. Thus, if we expect the workweek to decline as it has in the past, we might expect it to do so at a rate of about 2.5+ hours per decade. On this assumption the trend will appear as follows:

TABLE I

Projected Decline of the Workweek to 2000

1965	1975	1985	1995	2000
40	37.5	35	32.5	31.25

Aside from recent stability in the length of the workweek, there are other reasons to doubt whether these figures represent a meaningful forecast. In the first place, figures on the average workweek may be deceptive because they do not discriminate between different sectors of society. For example, the most rapidly expanding group in the American employment structure is that group called professional, technical, and kindred. For this group, together with those in managerial positions, it might be argued that there exists a counter-trend. For them the workweek is increasing. They have not more, but less leisure time.

Neither do figures on the average workweek discriminate between special populations like housewives whose children may be in school much of the time, whose "homemaking chores" may be hastened by the use of appliances, and whose leisure may be rapidly increasing. Thus, the length of the workweek is not in itself decisive evidence of the amount of available leisure time. Still, it is a clue.

Secondly, the length of the average workweek may be less important than the way free time is arranged. The number of working hours in the year may be reduced 25 percent by a reduction in the working hours of a five-day week. The same result can be accomplished by instituting a three-month vacation. The social consequences of these choices will be very different, however.

Forecast #2 - A More Complex Forecast

Any estimate of the long-term reduction in the workweek must consider other factors including (1) the rate of increase in productivity of the economy, (2) the acceptable level of per capita GNP, and most important and most uncertain, (3) the willingness of people to accept the benefits of increased productivity in greater amounts of free-time rather than in increased wealth. This latter factor is vital. It is an expression of precisely those attitudes toward work, leisure, time, material possessions, and freedom that are thought to be at issue in the educational relevance of increased leisure. Depending on the future of such values, very different social situations can be made to exist.

Therefore, instead of asking whether the long-term trend toward a shorter workweek will continue, it may be more useful to formulate a single moderate forecast against which other more extensive possibilities might be compared.

A moderate estimate of U.S. population growth can be based upon an annual rate of increase of about 1.5 percent. In recent years it has been as low as 1.2 and as high as 1.7. A rate of increase of about 1.5 percent would reflect a permanent decline in birth rates. Such a rate of increase will yield a U.S. population for 1985 of 256 million and for 2000 318 million. Before W.W. II, productivity increased in the U.S. at a rate of about 2 percent annually. Since then it has ranged around 3 percent. It is widely accepted that for the remainder of the century, it ought to average out at some point between 2.5 and 3.5 percent. Some expect it to reach 4.5 percent. Thus, a low estimate would be 2.5 percent; 3.0 percent would be reasonable; and 3.5 percent would probably be within reach.

In their volume, The Year 2000: A Framework for Speculation, Kahn and Wiener produce an interesting series of forecasts that relate these estimates to the length of the work year and to the rate of participation in the labor force to yield a series of possibilities for the year 2000. They first produce high and low estimates of GNP for the year 2000: high, 3.6 trillion

and low, 2.2 trillion. For a population of 318 million, the low estimate yields a per capita GNP of $6,920 or nearly twice the 1965 level of $3,500. The higher estimate yields a per capita GNP of about $11,320 or more than three times the 1965 level.

Let us examine the low estimate. With a population of 318 million, a rate of productivity increase at 3.0 annually and the current standard work year of slightly under 2,000 hours, the U.S. could reach the low GNP target in the year 2000 with only 30 percent of the population employed. Since the employment level in recent years has been only slightly less than 40 percent of the population, this reduction would represent a substantial and socially significant increase in leisure. The same target of GNP could be attained with 38 percent of the population working only about 1,500 hours per year or 43 percent working only 1,300 hours. These choices also would result in significant increases in the availability of leisure time.

With higher, but still reasonable increases in productivity, the potentialities for increased leisure become even more dramatic. At an annual increase of about 3.5 percent, it becomes possible to reach such a target of relative affluence with only 33 percent of the population working only about 1,500 hours annually or 38 percent working only 1,300 hours. Such a "modest" target for GNP seems easily within reach and could produce annual work years of between 1,300 and 1,500 hours, and in some cases with simultaneous substantial reductions in the proportion of the population employed.

Forecast #3 - <u>The Distribution of Work and Leisure Time</u>

The relevance of this last forecast is shown in the following table. It is assumed that, if given a choice, people will prefer to gain free time in concentrated blocks rather than in small increments widely dispersed throughout the year. Hence, the table focuses on combinations of working <u>days</u> rather than on the <u>length</u> of the working day. The table assumes throughout

that there are 10 legal holidays in a year.

TABLE II

Alternative Distributions of Annual Work and Leisure Time

Days - Hrs - Per Wk	Vacations	Work Days	Days Off	Annual Work Hrs
5 x 8 = 40	2	240	124	1920
	4	230	134	1840
	6	220	144	1760
5 x 7 = 35	2	240	124	1680
	4	230	134	1610
	6	220	144	1540
4 x 8 = 32	2	190	174	1520
	4	182	182	1456
	6	174	190	1392
4 x 7.5 = 30	2	190	174	1425
	4	182	182	1365
	6	174	190	1305

There are several points worth noting. (1) The decline of the workweek projected in Table I produces for the year 2000 a forecast that falls within the 30-32 hours of a four-day workweek. Thus, Table II contains some arrangements of the workweek and the workyear that are consistent with that long-term trend. (2) If we wished to explore the educational consequences of an abundance of leisure time, we might focus attention on that stage of social development when the labor force is engaged in work for only 50 percent of the days in the year. That point is one way to mark the beginning of a so-called "leisure society." Table II shows that any arrangement of a four-day workweek and a four week vacation will produce such an even split in the work year. (3) Furthermore, it is worth noting that the "moderate forecast" derived from the work of Kahn and Wiener calls for a combination of factors resulting in a work year producing from 1,500 working hours and a substantial lower participation rate in the labor force down to 1,300 and only a slight increase in the

participation rate. This range in annual working hours--1,300 to 1,500--approximates the lower and upper limits included in the four-day arrangements of Table II.

The "moderate forecast" represents an easily attainable target for the U.S. It follows that the establishment of a leisure society must be included among the choices that will be open to Americans in the next two to three decades. This will be true, moreover, even though there may be no current increase in leisure time.

These observations should not be construed as a prediction. It is not claimed that the leisure society will emerge within the next three decades. The moderate forecast formulates only one among many alternative sets of choices. It is an interesting forecast, however, because it represents a state of affairs not simply possible, but relatively easy to achieve within the American economy.

The picture of abundant leisure, however, is produced by accepting a fairly low target for GNP. Whether that target will be exceeded depends largely on whether the American people will be willing to forego greater economic gains in favor of greater increases in free time. If they are--and there are some indications that that is the trend--then the state of affairs described in this forecast is likely to occur much sooner. However, if the American values of work and success continue to prevail, and if their attainment continues to be measured by material acquisitions, then the modest estimate of GNP will be greatly exceeded, participation in the labor force may increase--most notably among women--and the availability of leisure may not be perceptably greater than it is now.

Clearly, then, it is not easy to justify the assumption that the availability of leisure time is rapidly increasing in America. It is possible, however, to justify the view that a decision to make it more available will be an increasingly realistic and more persistently formulated choice in the decades just ahead.